DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 981 CE 021 720

AUTHOR	Reubens, Beatrice G.
TITLE	The Transition from School to Work--the European Experience: Implications for Research and Development. Occasional Paper No. 49.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE	Feb 79
NOTE	21p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center Publications, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210 ($1.90)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Apprenticeships; Communication Skills; *Comparative Education; Educational Development; Educational Planning; Foreign Countries; Foreign Policy; *Instructional Systems; Interpersonal Competence; On the Job Training; Skilled Workers; Unemployment; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Europe; France; Germany; Great Britain

ABSTRACT

Examining the transition from school to work in Europe, this speech focuses on a comparison of initial occupational preparation for young people in France, Germany, and Great Britain. The desired competencies in new entrants to the labor market are listed in four categories: basic cognitive skills; personal qualities and work attitudes; interpersonal skills; analytical abilities and the ability to plan, organize, or make decisions; and specific occupational skills. A detailed description of national systems of skill training in France is provided. The following five issues regarding initial occupational preparation in Europe are presented: (1) What occupations should be designated for training purposes and how can one be separated from another? (2) How long should the training last? (3) In what setting should occupational skills be acquired? (4) Where in the educational and work cycle should this training occur? (5) Who should receive formal skill training? A question and answer section is included in which the author answers questions relating to topics such as apprenticeships, the vocational education system in France, women in vocational education, handicapped people in vocational education, teacher training programs in other countries, manpower and educational planning, and how vocational education in other countries will effect change in the United States' vocational education policy. (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171981

Occasional Paper No. 49

THE TRANSITION FROM SCHOOL TO WORK—THE EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE: IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

by

Beatrice G. Reubens

Senior Research Associate
Conservation of Human Resources
Columbia University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Magisos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

February 1979

CE 021 720

THE NATIONAL CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The National Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

The Lecture Series at the National Center for Research in Vocational Education was established to provide a forum for discussing current issues confronting educational research and development among distinguished professionals and National Center and Ohio State University staff. Points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent official National Center or Ohio State University position or policy.

PREFACE

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education at The Ohio State University is pleased to present Dr. Beatrice Reubens' thoughts on "The Transition from School to Work—The European Experience: Implications for Research and Development." Dr. Reubens is a Senior Research Associate in the Conservation of Human Resources at Columbia University.

In her lecture, Dr. Reubens discusses the organization of educational systems in several European countries including France, Germany, and Great Britain. She also presents and categorizes the "complaints" about the way young people are prepared for the world of work in other countries.

Additionally, Dr. Reubens points out that a high priority in most European countries is formal occupational preparation for young people. In this area, she discusses questions such as: (1) What occupations should be designated as training sites, (2) How long should the training period last, (3) In what setting should initial occupational skills be required, (4) At what point in the educational and work cycle of young people should this training occur, and (5) What kinds of young people should receive formal skill training?

Dr. Reubens received a B.A. from Brooklyn College, and an M.A. and Ph.D. from Columbia University. Prior to her present position, she was a lecturer in economics at Barnard College. She also has served as an economist with various governmental agencies including the U.S. Department of State, the Office of Strategic Services, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and the National Resources Planning Board.

Having traveled extensively in Europe and other areas, Dr. Reubens has served as a consultant for the OECD and the ONISEP in Paris; the Ministry of Colleges and Universities in Toronto, Ontario; the Department of Labor; and the National Commission on Youth. She also is the author of numerous publications on career education and the transition from school to work.

Once again, the National Center takes pride in presenting Dr. Reubens and her lecture, "The Transition from School to Work—The European Experience: Implications for Research and Development."

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

TRANSITION FROM SCHOOL TO WORK—THE EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE: IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The transition from school to work has become such a catchphrase that one must inquire what people actually have in mind. Yesterday, for example, I talked in Washington about the "Transition from School to Work" and it turned out to be a session on the causes of youth unemployment and programs to mitigate it. One of the main points I made was that the transition is a valid subject apart from youth unemployment. In fact, improvement in the transition might be important at a time when there was such high, full employment that each youngster had a choice among fifty jobs upon leaving full-time school.

I think that you in this group may be interested in a range of subjects that I have divided into two main parts in my studies. *Preparation for Work,* a study not quite completed, deals, on a comparative basis, with the cognitive and noncognitive skills needed to compete successfully in the labor market and with specific basic occupational skills whether they be imparted through the educational system or at the workplace. *Bridges to Work,* published as a book last year and shortly to appear in shortened version as a Department of Labor monograph, contains a cross-country analysis of what I call "the transition services." The first of these services is educational-occupational information, in which I stress the occupational implications of educational choices. The second service is educational-occupational guidance and counseling. The third is job placement. The fourth type of service concerns induction to work, and the fifth is the follow-up of young workers.

My own preference is to talk about my work in progress rather than work already published. I shall be glad to answer questions about the transition services, if some of you are most concerned about them. But I will begin by talking about the preparation for work and especially occupational skills.

The view that there are serious deficiencies in the ways that young people are prepared for working life is widely prevalent in virtually all industrialized countries. Criticism falls on the schools, society, the family, and the young people, but mostly on the schools. There is a great similarity from country to country in the complaints about how young people are prepared for work. The outstanding deficiencies cited can be grouped under four headings. By the same token, a fourfold classification can be made of the desired competencies in new entrants to the labor market. The four categories are:

1. Basic cognitive skills—skills of communication, comprehension, and computation. Often a complaint on this point is accompanied by the charge that pupils' standards have declined over recent years, but scientific evidence is still to be accumulated. In any case, the significant issue is whether there are some young people who are so deficient in these skills that they cannot perform available jobs adequately. Employers in many countries say there are many in this category.

2. Personal qualities and work attitudes. The English-speaking countries are considerably more vocal on this point than other countries. Responsibility, punctuality, pride in work, attendance records, appearance, behavior, etc. are some of the specifics on which better performance is desired.

3. Interpersonal skills; analytical abilities; and the ability to plan, organize, or make decisions. These are not skills that are expected of young people entering low-level jobs, but many employers discern an inadequacy among young people they hire or wish to hire.

4. Specific occupational skills. The attitudes of employers in various countries range from those who expect to give all of the skill training themselves to those who expect young people to arrive on the labor market with a fairly full set of occupational skills. France is an example of a country whose employers expect young people to arrive at their first jobs with specific occupational skills. I was told that after World War II when France decided to undertake rapid economic development under its indicative planning system, government and industry reached an agreement. Industry promised to push economic development and government promised to provide occupational skill training.

In surveys American employers usually have said that they would provide the occupational skills if the schools would impart the basic literacy. However, a structured skill training for new entrants is less visible in the U.S. than elsewhere. We have no overall national system of skill training that is recognized or implemented widely either in regard to initial skills or further training. Other countries have more highly structured systems: France, Germany, and Great Britain all have a distinctive approach. The French system is in some ways the most centralized and organized and I will sketch its main features.

The French educational system is directed nationally at all levels and aims at uniformity throughout the country. There are two parallel streams after compulsory education ends at age sixteen and these provide academic and occupational education of all kinds. A complex system of governmentally controlled degrees, diplomas, certificates, and examinations provides a credentialing system that is directly and officially tied to employment.

As part of French indicative planning, all occupations are classified into half a dozen categories in an occupational hierarchy constructured according to the amount and level of general and vocational education considered necessary. The manpower planning authorities specify the precise educational and training qualifications considered necessary for entry jobs at each major occupational level. Very little room is allowed for alternative sets of entry qualifications or for upward mobility from one level to another, although recently this factor has received more recognition.

The five-year detailed manpower forecasts of the Planning Office are used to plan nationally and in each locality for the type and number of educational facilities and courses required to produce the manpower shown in the Plan. Frequent reorganizations of the structure and content of the educational system are in part motivated by the desire to influence the educational-occupational choices of young people which thus far have not conformed closely to the planners' suggestions. Lacking any powers of compulsion, public officials have relied on exhortation to young people. The goal is to have no one leave compulsory school at age sixteen to enter work directly; about 200,000 a year now do so. Another goal is that all who take an academic curriculum in an upper secondary school or university should finish with a specific occupational skill course. France is one of the few European countries where it is said that a university graduate without a specific occupational training has a greater likelihood of being unemployed than an eighteen-year old who has completed a two-year vocational education program.

The implementation of the French system is impeded not only by the behavior of young people but also by the failure of employers to accept the categories and classifications of the authorities. Moreover, employers complain that the system does not deliver young people who have the promised or appropriate skills. Whether the fault is in the planners' conceptions, the administrators' execution, or the actual teaching in the classroom is not clear. It would be hard to argue that any other country provides France with a better model to follow, given French circumstances and institutions.

Outside the United States, the view rarely is taken that a good general education is sufficient occupational preparation. Few will accept that young people may perhaps need some brief informal on-the-job training, but no formal occupational preparation. The question of initial occupational preparation for young people is a high-priority issue in most countries.

In order to make some generalizations I have divided the subject into a few simple issues on which opinions differ from one country to another. I have considered the following: (1) what occupations should be designated for training purposes and how can one be separated from another; (2) how long should the training period last; (3) in what setting should initial occupational skills be acquired; (4) at what point in the educational and work cycle of young people should this training occur; and (5) what kinds of young people should receive formal skill training. Here then are my overall reactions to these questions.

Issue 1. The range of occupations included in systems of initial occupational skill training varies greatly from country to country. For example, I was surprised to discover that New Zealand offers apprenticeships in golf course greens-keeping. Countries also define individual occupations differently. To some extent the definition of what constitutes an individual occupation and how it differs from another occupation even varies within countries according to which training system is involved.

Definitions of occupations appear to have developed largely in response to considerations other than the efficient provision of occupational skill training. Therefore, in several countries official efforts are under way to redefine and regroup occupations according to the needs of a training program. They are trying to identify transferable and common skills, to merge occupations, and to form clusters or families of occupations for training purposes as distinguished from guidance or statistical purposes. Researchers in Germany have analyzed the occupations of employed skilled workers, 90 percent of whom had gone through apprenticeships. The occupation practiced was compared to the apprenticeship occupation. It was found that training in certain occupations was particularly conducive to later occupational mobility and to a wide range of occupational choice. Other apprenticeships were disproportionately associated with a lifetime as a semi-skilled or unskilled worker. This information is being used both to influence the composition of the apprenticeships offered by employers and to influence the occupational choices made by new apprentices. Britain has an interesting project to improve training which is called "Grouping of Skills." The European Common Market has several projects to examine occupational categories and definitions in its nine member countries with the purpose of standardizing all of the definitions and classifications and ultimately bringing uniformity to the structure and content of training in the member countries.

Issue 2. The duration of occupational skill training for new entrants and the degree of mastery expected differs considerably across countries, even when the occupations seem to be the same. In apprenticeship, countries where craft unions are influential definitely stipulate more years but not necessarily more hours of training. Moreover, within countries, different training methods may impose differing durations of training for ostensibly the same occupations and skill levels. On the other hand, in some countries there is a typical training length, regardless of the skill. Countries such as France which have government examination for occupational diplomas avoid this by giving exactly the same examinations to those who have attended vocational schools, those who have completed an apprenticeship, and those who have gained on-the-job experience.

Issue 3. Initial occupational skill training can be given either in an employer-based system or in an education-based system. Almost every country has some forms of each type of training for new entrants. The most common varieties are apprenticeship and vocational education. But

countries vary greatly in the weight they place on the different methods and in their judgment about the virtues and deficiencies of each in theory and in practice. In every country I've visited I've asked the authorities the question: How do you decide which occupations should be taught through vocational education and which should be taught through apprenticeship? Everywhere the answer was the same: The more practical rather than theoretical the skill training seems to be, the more it seems to be imparted through informal rather than formal instruction and the more likely it is to be conducted through employer-based training (especially apprenticeship) rather than education-based. Conversely a high theoretical content suggests school-based training. Even when the official regulations provide that either method may be used, actual practice seems to follow the rule of thumb I have just cited. If a trend exists, it is toward more school-based training because of an increased theoretical content in occupations.

Countries do differ a great deal in where they draw the line between occupations that seem suited to employer-based training and those that should be education-based. France and Belgium are strong supporters of vocational education and leave only a residual role for apprenticeship, which is centered on the traditional crafts. French vocational schools for sixteen to eighteen year-olds are established and directed nationally and therefore tend to be equipped and conducted uniformly. They make our best vocational high schools look like kindergartens. Nevertheless, employers are not completely satisfied with the present system, and some urge more government support for in-the-firm training. In the same way, political parties and the trade union movement in Germany and Switzerland have sought the transfer of apprenticeship to full-time schools.

I have found no good solution to the inherently difficult problem of imparting occupational skills to new entrants. There are theoretical and practical faults and virtues in every system. Also national preferences and prejudices carry a heavy weight in the actual decisions. I believe that countries can learn from one another about ways to improve particular training delivery systems but I doubt that a country can decide on the proper balance among the various training systems on the basis of other countries' experiences. One reason for this is that a trade-off exists between a strong and large apprenticeship system and a high proportion of the age group in higher education. Germany, Austria, and Switzerland—the countries that give the largest role to employer-based training, mostly in the form of apprenticeship—have had a delayed and careful expansion of upper secondary and higher education. They also have not provided as much full-time vocational education as young people would like, and some young people go into apprenticeship because places are not available in vocational schools. These countries are not shy about citing the savings to the public purse that result from having employers bear a share of the costs of educating teenagers.

Another point should be made about comparisons of vocational education and apprenticeship. Apprenticeship is not simply skill training. It has functions and a potential in regard to new entrants that vocational education lacks. It eases the transition from school to work. It is a planned means of socializing young people to the ways of the work world. Those with a Germanic background say that it produces industrial discipline. They say this boldly as if it were a good thing that we have forgotten all about. Apprenticeship is a form of employment that yields reasonably good earnings these days, and it provides a more suitable social status for some young people than they have as pupils.

I have been impressed in my visits abroad to discover that countries, like Germany, with a strong apprenticeship system for school leavers have fewer complaints about the difficulties of moving young people from school to work than other countries. They cope with youth unemployment, which is heavily concentrated on those who never entered apprenticeship or who dropped out of it, by preparing unemployed young people to enter apprenticeship rather than devising emergency or remedial youth unemployment programs.

One of the encouraging aspects of the debate over vocational education versus apprenticeship is that a certain amount of convergence is apparent between the two methods. There is increasing use of combinations of vocational education and apprenticeship. Full-time schooling serves a preparatory or introductory function in most cases. Apart from this development, apprenticeship in many countries now provides an enlarged role for general education as well as related theoretical studies. In countries where such instruction is not compulsory by law, it is so prevalent that few apprentices do not have paid release time. The United States and Canada are farthest behind in the development of fully-paid related education during working hours.

For its part, vocational education increasingly includes a practical component in a firm. Sweden has made such practical experience mandatory for most of the vocational courses in its upper secondary school. I think the time may have come to consider making practical experience a compulsory part of vocational courses in our high schools and community colleges. We have relied on an expansion of cooperative education and similar programs to obtain this combination, but it is a slow and peripheral approach.

In a wider perspective our experiments with career education models outside schools have set the stage for a partial deschooling of vocational education. The Dutch proposal called "participatory education" is another interesting approach to combining school, training, work, and community involvement. In this plan, the Dutch government would pay employers for their participation.

In general, my comparative study leads me to question the notion that full-time education until the age of eighteen is the most desirable model for all young Americans. Of course we need to examine our feasible alternatives very carefully before we abandon or change the present system. This brings me to the point that only American and Canadian apprenticeships recruit from young adults with prior work experience, hardly serving teenagers. The average American apprentice is twenty-five years old, according to the most recent statistics. Most have worked before and many are married with dependents. At the age when apprentices in most other countries have finished their training, most American and Canadian apprentices have not yet begun. Is it any wonder that we have the highest apprentice dropout rate when we have the same wage scale for our apprentices as Australia and New Zealand have for apprentices who start at age fifteen or sixteen? Before World War II American apprentices were sixteen to eighteen year-olds when entering their training. It was the return of World War II veterans and the subsidization available through the GI Bill that changed the situation initially, and employers now seem to prefer the older recruits.

I think that apprenticeship would function more effectively in the U.S. if it recruited teenagers, perhaps starting with the sixteen year-olds. I am aware that because of anti-age discrimination legislation, this cannot be done by legislative provision. But countries with no legal statements about entry age have managed to make their apprenticeship consist entirely of school leavers. They also have made full provision for adult training and retraining to the skilled worker level so that no one is deprived because of having missed apprenticeship in youth. This is easier to organize in countries such as the continental European nations, where craft trade unions do not restrict the total number of apprentices or place limits on entry to skilled status from sources other than apprenticeship.

Craft unions do place limits on numbers of apprentices in Ireland, Great Britain, and Australia and to a lesser extent in the U.S. and Canada. This control by trade unions is in fact one of the chief ways that the continental European model of apprenticeship can be distinguished from the model in the English-speaking countries. As an English-speaking country, the U.S. is fortunate that the trade unions involved in apprenticeship have not made it the chief or only means of access to skilled status. We should be able to establish training opportunities for adults which are equal

to those for teenage apprentices and obtain full trade union acceptance provided that the unions are consulted about the total number under both types of programs. In my opinion apprenticeship has greatest significance as an initial occupational skill program and teenagers are the logical group to become apprentices.

It has become fashionable in the U.S. to claim that our teenagers, especially problem groups, are not ready to settle down to prolonged and demanding training, but instead must wait until they reach a more mature age for serious occupational training. Here is a case where comparative study causes some questions to be raised. Are American young people constitutionally different from those in other countries? Overseas they seem mature enough to start apprenticeship at age fifteen or sixteen. Moreover, Germany has been able to include low academic achievers and physically and mentally handicapped school leavers in apprenticeship by adapting the requirements and the training. Can we be so sure about the validity of our rather stiff entrance requirements? Germany and Austria have come to the point where over 90 percent of their school leavers either are in apprenticeship or full-time education and under 10 percent enter unskilled work. Our record for high school graduates isn't that good.

Perhaps we have been projecting onto our young people's shoulders the deficiencies in our institutional arrangements which fail to provide adequate skill training. I am not suggesting that apprenticeship is the answer for all of our youth with problems nor that we can build apprenticeship to the German level—the corresponding number would be over 5 million apprentices. But on the basis of other countries' experiences, I do think that we require some new initiatives of a permanent kind for our sixteen to eighteen year-olds who now play truant or get little out of school. They seem to need a respectable alternative to full-time school. This could combine compulsory part-time schooling until age eighteen with a work-training situation that is not temporary, remedial, ad hoc, or established as a youth unemployment program. A British program called unified vocational preparation, designed mainly to serve employed youngsters who enter low-paying dead-end jobs, is worth some attention.

I know how complex this whole field is, but the strength of comparative analysis is that it shows that other countries are doing things that seem to us, on the face of it, difficult or impossible. My final word is that slavish imitation of other countries is of course not the answer either. We must work out our own solutions, but a knowledge of what others are doing is a useful backdrop.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question: What are the differences in values that young people are socialized to in the United States and in other countries?

Young people in European countries have almost the same complaints about life and work as young people in the United States. Some react negatively to dirty, blue collar, dead-end, or shift work jobs. They have been more easily able to reject such jobs in Europe until recently because of high, full employment and the resulting inflow of foreign workers who took the least desirable jobs. In Europe social distinctions about appropriate types of work for given levels of education are far stronger than they are here where many college graduates accept jobs that would be unacceptable to their European counterparts. For example, the construction industry, which used to receive a lot of unacademically inclined French youth now has become almost entirely an occupation for foreign workers and it hasn't changed much because of the recession. In general, I do not think the work ethic varies much among youth in different countries and all of them sense a declining commitment to high standards of work quality.

On the other side there are some countries which consider it unnecessary and undesirable that a high proportion of the population should become college graduates. Skilled blue collar workers are officially praised and efforts are being made to change their public image, social prestige, and relative earnings. In Germany proposals have been made that government officials' salaries should be reduced in order to achieve social equity and encourage young people to choose skilled crafts instead of administrative occupations. I can't see that there's any such movement in the United States. Such drives make good policy sense in Europe for two reasons: (1) they can help solve the growing unemployment problem among college graduates, and (2) they can ease the pressure to expand higher education—almost all of which is paid for directly out of the public purse, including subsistence loans and grants to students. In contrast, industry bears a large part of the cost of training skilled workers. Thus far, such drives have not produced much change in social perceptions of occupational stratification.

Question: How much internal debate about apprenticeship programs exists in other countries?

There is considerable debate. In Germany there was a very interesting turnaround. When I first examined the German apprenticeship system early in the 1970s, the Socialist Party, which recently had come to power, favored placing apprenticeship entirely in the schools because apprentices were seen as "the forgotten majority." This designation arose from the fact that many apprentices suffered poor on-the-job training and off-the-job related education, in spite of new legislation in 1969. Reform proposals centered on incorporating apprentices into the full-time education system. But the plans were abandoned when the government saw what the cost of absorbing apprentices into the educational system would be and how much industrial expenditure on training would be lost. Instead, officials declared that apprenticeship could be improved in all of its aspects. They have done a great deal and it is a better functioning system now. But it still has flaws, so considerable internal debate continues. Currently, the official view is that apprentices are part of the full-time educational system. This is, in my opinion, a highly debatable point, since apprentices are

wage-earners who take part in ordinary production to some degree. Whatever else is said about apprenticeship in Germany, however, it should be pointed out that it is a strong, resilient institution which has greatly expanded in the last few recession years at a time when employment in general declined. The power of public policy has been effectively demonstrated in this case.

Question: You paint a detailed picture of a comprehensive, controlled vocational education system in France. How does (or doesn't) this system develop viability as rapid technological changes occur?

This is a weakness, centered in the Ministry of Education which controls matters fairly thoroughly and does not believe in practical experience for vocational students. French industry has a nominal advisory role, but when I've talked to people at the "Patronat," which is the association of French employers, they complain bitterly about how their advice is not really followed. Still, relations are closer than in the U.S. A division between French industry and education exists partly because of an educationally centralized system. The Revolution of 1789 transferred education to national control in order to ensure liberty, fraternity, and equality. It has a wonderful background but it's come to be quite restrictive. Another factor is that many people pay more attention to form than substance in France. They pass laws but often don't check on how well they are implemented. They refer to the existence of the law and consider that they've therefore done something. When I asked questions about what had *happened* under a particular law, people would look at me with some surprise and say calmly that they didn't know. So national ways of doing things also have to be taken into account.

Question: What are the implications of vocational systems in other countries for effecting change in the U.S. national policy of vocational education?

The more I do comparative research, the fewer straight translations I see from one country to another. But one thing that seems pretty clear is that our vocational education system has suffered from not having combined classroom and actual work experience all along the line. Such an approach works very well in Europe—whether in apprenticeship programs or in vocational education. The machines available to a vocational school which has close contacts with industry are different from those in a system which has little contact. Industry becomes interested in having up-to-date machines in schools from which they take young people for practical work. However, there are two sides to this issue. I've heard complaints in England from small employers that the training boards are doing a disservice by putting in the latest machinery in their centers where apprentices receive off-the-job training. These employers said that, after going through such training, young people would come to the firm and have to work on older machines in less pleasant surroundings. Some employers also objected to the training centers being very hygenic and having all the occupational safety features because the trainees would find conditions in the firm that weren't as good as in their training center, and would leave the firm soon. Naturally the most technologically advanced employers carry the most weight with these training boards and insist on having such new equipment.

If we can reconsider the way we run our vocational education system and interest American employers in participating actively, as our cooperative education operates, this would be a desirable change, based on European experience.

Question: There is widespread agreement in the vocational education field that there are many out-of-school and unemployed youth in the U.S. and an increased emphasis on developing vocational education programs for the disadvantaged. But we face the problem of attracting youth to these programs. Can you suggest some strategies?

One of the things that people expect when we talk about other countries is that they're going to hear how much better the other countries are than we. This just isn't so. There are areas in which we're ahead. One of these is the recognition of the disadvantaged group—identifying them and providing vocational education programs for them. Most of the European countries are just beginning in this area. Germany and Austria have begun to open apprenticeship to academically low achievers and the physically and mentally handicapped. The system to aid particular groups was begun during the recession in Germany and Austria. The large firms set the model and publicized this to other employers and got them to agree to set up programs for academic low achievers. The advantage has been that the enrollees are likely to have permanent jobs at the end of training. One of the chief problems of our youth training programs has been that the final outcomes do not clearly show such good integration into the work world. In part, of course, it is due to our having had much higher unemployment, generally, and for youth.

Question: How about in the area of involving more women in vocational education programs that traditionally have been dominated by males?

We're in the lead in this area, too. Only Sweden has made a longer and stronger effort, though it has not been crowned with great success. In the sixties Sweden developed textbooks for elementary children which portrayed women and men in nontraditional roles—a man wearing an apron and washing dishes, a woman sitting in a chair, smoking a cigar, and reading the newspaper with slippers placed conspicuously beside her chair. What's amazing, though, is the small influence these efforts have had on actually getting women and men into nontraditional work settings. In Sweden there is an occupational information program in the schools in which, at age fifteen, children begin to spend several weeks in a workplace, learning about the social organization of work and the nature of specific work tasks. It has been found that girls still choose areas such as nursing, sales and clerical work, and teaching. While the boys make a wider range of choices, they rarely ask for female-dominated occupations. Sweden also has an employment program in which employers are subsidized to place men and women in nontraditional jobs. It has not made any dramatic changes. The greatest contribution of the Swedish approach is its recognition that if many women are shifted to nontraditional work, a problem will be created unless men also accept nontraditional jobs. We seem concerned almost entirely with women. However, in terms of allowing women more choices, we've probably come as far as any of the European countries.

Question: The models you have presented so far were developed or have passed through the industrial stage. What about trends that exist in the Third World countries that are moving into the industrial stage?

My answer to that is easy. The field of my expertise is limited to advanced industrial countries. But I have traveled extensively in less developed countries and I recently attended a conference at which representatives from Third World countries stressed the differences between themselves and the developed countries, one of them being their educational/training needs. They do favor vocational over general education and resent the legacy of an elitist educational system from their former colonial powers. While they tend to blame their educational troubles on this factor, I am inclined to think that population and resource pressures and other issues are equally important.

Question: Do you have the same ideas on the handicapped as you do on the disadvantaged?

Not quite. When I talked about the disadvantaged, I was thinking in terms of our emphasis on minority groups—socially handicapped. In speaking about those who are physically and mentally handicapped, I would say that the European countries are ahead of us in general provisions for young people. They have special programs for the handicapped. For example, there's a good British work experience program for young people who leave high school and don't get a job for six months or so. Yet we've probably gone further in making it possible for handicapped youth to advance to higher education.

Question: Are the apprenticeship training programs in Europe that interface with the educational community responsive to the changing needs of the employment marketplace? How responsive are these programs to job retraining for people in settings in which jobs are obsolete?

Apprenticeship programs have a double disadvantage in economic responsiveness—employers fill their own training needs rather than those of the economy and they also tend to cut back on recruits in recession periods. However, apprenticeship is not at all engaged in retraining those whose jobs have become obsolete. All of the apprenticeship countries have elaborate retraining programs outside of apprenticeship to serve such people. Unlike our CETA programs, these programs accept some people who are employed. These are not conceived as programs for the disadvantaged, and they often "cream" applicants. They feel that if the program meets the needs of industry, there will be room for others at the bottom. But if unacceptable people are trained, the program would get a bad name. They look surprised if the issue of creaming is raised and ask, "Isn't that the natural thing to do? We always take the most able candidates for anything we're doing."

With regard to making apprenticeship more responsive to changing employment conditions, several approaches have been taken. Subsidies have been offered to employers to encourage recruitment during economic downturns. Group training centers and off-the-job training programs are provided to upgrade and modernize training, and government undertakes supervision of the revised curricula for on-the-job training.

Germany's threat to levy a tax on employers if they did not increase apprenticeships was seen as an effort to take the program away from industry; rather than lose the program, employers have provided a large increase in the number of apprenticeship openings. The composition and curricula of apprenticeships are more difficult to influence. Various official groups, on which education representatives sit, review the curricula and the qualifications for completing apprenticeships. They also consolidate or break down occupations for training purposes and create new ones. There are time lags but the leadership of big industry sets the real pace and the administrative changes follow behind.

Question: Can you provide suggestions for integrating vocational education into an overall school to work transition strategy? Do we *need* an overall strategy?

I do think we need such a strategy. I've indicated that we ought to rethink our pattern of full-time education for everybody through high school. Vocational education could be heavily involved in all of the transition programs which flourish under a million names. I couldn't begin to catalog or evaluate all of them and this multiplicity is a fault. Vocational education could be a leader in

this movement if it changed its self-image and accepted a direct relationship to the world of work, instead of preparing people for work. In terms of size and experience, vocational education is ahead of a lot of the experiential, work experience, work preparation programs.

Question: One theme that emerged in your talk was that of societal and cultural differences among students. We in the United States stress equality, freedom of choice, and so on. How do we insure the maintenance of cultural values without having more students reject occupational training programs?

Perhaps we should reconsider some of our values if they conflict with the facts. Our values downgrade occupational training and place it second best. As a result 80 percent of the young people have aspirations to complete college but only 20 percent do it. The rest are doing something else and feel cheated. It may be that we haven't the capacity to deliver on all of our values or that our objectives are prematurely high. When we look comparatively at occupational structures and occupational mobility and take into account differences among the economies of these countries, we discover that the U.S. has hardly any more occupational mobility or room at the top than the European countries.

I'm not advocating the alternative, which is to have low expectations. In the British system, for example, everybody is judged basically by social class and excessive ambition is frowned on. They don't know what to do with outsiders, such as Asian immigrants who have high aspirations and want to be doctors and lawyers. They are put down by British guidance counselors.

In the U.S. they'd get lots of support. But we also have more trouble than other countries in selling vocational education of a less exalted character. It is a matter of trade-offs so long as one cannot alter the values to conform with reality.

Question: What long-range organization do you see for manpower planning and educational planning?

Clearly the two ought to be integrated, but only a few countries do this adequately. The Scandinavian countries are leaders in coordinating planning and execution because they see the two fields as inextricably linked. The whole educational establishment sits in on manpower planning sessions and the whole manpower establishment sits in on educational planning sessions. Bringing together the different interests and perspectives, they obtain cooperative thinking and action. For example, when the need for teachers declined sharply, they closed down some teacher training schools without worrying about taking away somebody's option to be a teacher. Matching supply and demand seemed to be more important. They have also conducted campaigns when they thought that higher education enrollments were rising too rapidly in terms of employment possibilities and individual expectations. As a result, Sweden had a downturn not only in numbers enrolling in colleges but also in the percentage of the age group enrolling.

This coordination of planning for education and manpower is *not* easy to replicate, especially in large countries. In the small countries, they don't protect their turf in quite the same way that we do.

Question: You mentioned several trade-offs in youth unemployment and transition from school to work. Are there others that we're consciously making that we need to

address, for instance, in the broad areas of youth unemployment or transition; decentralization vs. centralization; high school central planning vs. local autonomy?

We seem to have opted for local autonomy against the possible benefits of central planning without ever having tried real planning. Currently there is great distrust of Washington. The popular belief is that Washington can't do anything very well. Such critics have not judged the performance of all the other levels of government with the same severity. In my opinion, these other levels would not stand up very well if they were so judged. It is not clear to me that there are net benefits from our current choices or that considered trade-offs have been made.

On youth unemployment, I feel that we tend to shift ground. Some who say that there are not enough jobs for young people in total decide that the way to cope with the situation is to give skills to the unemployed. But is this an answer? A large part of the job vacancies for youth results from people constantly leaving or getting fired, mostly from low skill jobs. We do not have a huge body of youth job vacancies that remains unfilled for, say, six months at a time, because young people with skills are unavailable. If one totals all the young people who want *good* jobs, then there are not enough jobs. Programs that simply give employability skills to unemployed young people result in making them compete with others who already have jobs or in their not getting the expected jobs and being dissatisfied.

The analogy I use is the game of musical chairs. It's a game in which somebody has to lose, if the game is played the normal way. Somebody has to go "out" every time. If, as the game is played, a certain type of person loses every single time and we don't think this is right, we begin to think of ways of picking the losers a little more equally. We can train the disadvantage players to run around the chairs as well as the others do. Soon the losers would constitute a cross-section of the whole population, instead of being just the disadvantaged. That is to say, unemployment would be distributed more equitably. An alternative way of looking at this is that musical chairs may not be the right game to play. We should ask for more chairs so everyone gets at least one seat. Maybe there should even be a couple of extra chairs so that peope can have a choice of chairs!

Question: Are other countries using vocational teaching training programs that are different from the ones in the United States?

I have observed some. In particular, I visited a French special vocational school for teachers that had just been opened. It was run in conjunction with a full vocational school so that teachers were in constant contact with practice and all prospective teachers quickly moved into the classroom or workshop. In Germany, Austria, and Switzerland they prefer to recruit skilled workers with practical experience. Since they may have an inadequate pedagogical base, the requirements have been upgraded recently.

Question: Who should decide what vocational training should consist of—basic academic skills, occupational knowledge, and so on—in other countries and in the U.S.?

All the interested parties, working together, would be the best solution. In the United States we have a lot of divergent opinions. Many American employers prefer a good academic high school education to a vocational education, even for blue collar jobs. They distrust the schools and believe they should concentrate on basic literacy and coping skills. This belief has come through in a number of surveys of employers. In the European countries, employers seem to have more belief in formal training and more influence on its content and structure.

Question: You discussed increasing the options for training for young people and the apprenticeship model in England. Does this system have a broader base?

I talked about a British model of apprenticeship which is replicated fairly closely in Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand and to a lesser extent in the U.S. and Canada. It covers the English-speaking countries and serves a limited proportion of young people. In Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, the main apprenticeship countries, the proportions served are much higher and there is a wider range of occupations. The American apprenticeship system has a potential for expansion in several directions and top officials of the Department of Labor are among the strongest apprenticeship advocates. They are seeking to expand apprenticeship by introducing it in new areas, such as health services and by enlarging it in fields where it is now small. They also want women and minorities to share more of the openings. Realistically, however, I do not think apprenticeship can ever become the major training program in the U.S. or the other English-speaking countries. Supplementary programs will be needed and the British Unified Vocational Preparation and Work Experience programs are examples of experiments outside traditional vocational education.

LEADERSHIP SERIES
IN VOCATIONAL AND CAREER EDUCATION

Barlow, Melvin. ***Implications from the History of Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 15—$1.00).

Bell, Terrel H. ***The Place of Vocational Education in Higher Education: Implications for Education R&D***, 1976 (DL 4—$1.50).

Bell, Terrel H. and Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education: The U.S.O.E. Perspective***, 1974 (OC 4—$1.50).

Bottoms, James E. ***Implications of the New Vocational Education Legislation for Program Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 23—$1.75).

Buzzell, Charles H. ***Productivity: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 19—$1.00).

Clark, David L. ***Federal Policy in Educational Research and Development***, 1974 (OC 5—$1.50).

Clark, David L. ***Research and Development Productivity in Educational Organizations***, 1978 (OC 41—$2.20).

Cohen, Wilbur J. ***Needed Federal Policy in Education for Century III***, 1977 (OC 24—$1.90).

Cyphert, Frederick. ***Forces Affecting Program Development in Higher Education: Is Anyone Driving?*** 1975 (OC 11—$1.00).

Delacruz, Joseph B. ***Educational Programs for Native Americans: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 40—$1.90).

Ellis, John. ***Vocational Education and Federal Priorities***, 1978 (OC 47—$1.90).

Ellis, Mary L. ***Vocational Education: The Future Is Now***, 1978 (OC 37—$1.90).

Evans, Rupert. ***Vocational Education R and D in the Past Decade: Implications for the Future***, 1976 (OC 18—$1.00).

Fallstrom, Charles M. ***The Changing Secondary Education Scene: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 22—$1.75).

Gideonse, Hendrik. ***A Model for Educational Research and Development: 1985***, 1978 (OC 44—$2.20).

Ginzberg, Eli. ***Strategies for Education Reform***, 1972-73 (DL 1—$1.00).

Gleazer, Edmund J. ***View on Community and Junior College Education***, 1975 (OC 9—$1.00).

Goldhammer, Keith. ***Extending Career Education Beyond the Schoolhouse Walls***, 1974 (OC 3—$2.00).

Halperin, Samuel. ***Emerging Educational Policy Issues in the Federal City: A Report from Washington***, 1978 (OC 42—$2.20).

Herr, Edwin L. ***Work Focused Guidance for Youth in Transition: Some Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 43—$2.20).

Hicks, Laurabeth L. ***Programs of Guidance and Counseling Becoming of Age: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***, 1977 (OC 25—$1.75).

Hoyt, Kenneth B. ***Career Education, Vocational Education, and Occupational Education: An Approach to Defining Differences***, 1973-74 (DL 2—$1.25).

Jennings, John F. and Radcliffe, Charles W. ***Commentary on Legislation Affecting Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1977 (OC 27—$1.90).

Kolstoe, Oliver P. ***Implications of Research Findings on Vocational and Career Education for the Mentally Handicapped***, 1977 (OC 33—$1.90).

Kottman, Roy M. ***Building a Constituency for Research and Development***, 1975 (OC 10—$1.00).

Krathwohl, David. ***Improving Educational Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 21—$2.20).

Kreitlow, Burton W. ***Trends in Adult Education with Implications for Vocational Education***, 1976 (OC 13—$1.25).

Kruger, Daniel H. ***Occupational Preparation Programs: Implications for Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 31—$1.90).

Levitan, Sar A. ***The Unemployment Numbers Is the Message***, 1977 (OC 38—$1.90).

McCage, Ronald D. ***The Development of a Comprehensive State Capacity for Program Improvement***, 1978 (OC 34—$1.75).

McCune, Shirley D. ***The Organized Teaching Profession and R&D***, 1977 (OC 29—$1.90).

Marland, Sidney P. ***Career Education: Retrospect and Prospect***, 1974-75 (DL 3—$2.00).

Martin, Edwin. ***New Directions in Vocational Education for the Handicapped: Implications for Research and Devleopment***, 1978 (OC 35—$1.75).

Parnes, Herbert S. ***A Conceptual Framework for Human Resource Policy: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1976 (OC 14—$1 00)

Petty, Reginald. ***Trends and Issues in Vocational Education: Implications for Vocational Education Research and Development***, 1978 (OC 46—$1.90).

Pucinski, Roman. ***The Role of State and Local Advisory Councils in Vocational Education***, 1978 (OC 36—$1.90).

Reider, Corinne H. ***Women, Work and Vocational Education***, 1977 (OC 26—$1.90).

Rosen, Howard. ***Recent Manpower Legislation and Programs: Implications for Research and Development***, 1975 (OC 7—$1.00).

Scanlon, Robert C. ***Public Schools for the 80's: Implications for Vocational and Career Education R&D***, 1976 (OC 20—$1.50).

Siffin, William. ***Institutional Building in Technical Assistance: The Design Perspective and Some Implications for Research and Development in Vocational Education***, 1975 (OC 8—$1.00).

Simpson, Elizabeth J. ***The Home as a Learning Center for Vocational Development***, 1976 (OC 16—$1.00).

Sticht, Thomas G. ***Literacy and Vocational Competence***, 1978 (OC 39—$2.80).

Wallace, Bertran F. ***Desegregation and Its Implications for Vocational and Career Education***, 1977 (OC 30—$1.75).

Wills, Joan. ***Youth Unemployment: Implications for Vocational Education R&D***, 1977 (OC 32—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. and Ford, Gerald R. ***Bringing the World of Work and the Institutions of Education Closer Together***, 1977 (OC 28—$1.75).

Wirtz, Willard R. ***Community Education Work Councils***, 1976 (OC 17—$1.00).

ORDERING INFORMATION

All prices include postage and handling. When ordering use series numbers and titles. Orders of $10.00 or less will be accepted on a cash, check, or money order basis only. Purchase orders will be accepted for orders in excess of $10.00. Please make check or money order payable to: **The National Center for Research in Vocational Education**. Mail remittance and/or purchase order to: National Center Publications, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210. (Prices subject to change.)